



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,802	09/22/2000	Shigefumi Wada	4495-006	9689

7590 06/02/2004

Lowe Hauptman Gopstein Gilman & Berner LLP
1700 Diagonal Road Suite 310
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/667,802

Applicant(s)

WADA ET AL.

Examiner

Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5 and 12-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5 and 12-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 23, 2004, has been entered.

Claims 3-5 and 12-17 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendments to the claims do not appropriately address the rejection of claims 3-5 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, this rejection is maintained and reproduced below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 3-5 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. The claims are generally indefinite, failing to conform to current U.S. practice. They are replete with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph problems such as lack of antecedent basis. The claims should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In light of this, a lack of a rejection based on prior art to a particular claim should not be construed as an indication of impending allowability of that claim.

Below are some examples of such problems in the claims. Given the numerousness of problems in the pending claims, no attempt has been made to produce an exhaustive list of such problems, and accordingly, it is Applicant's responsibility to carefully review each claim and make all appropriate revisions to bring the claims into compliance.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "said database" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the database" in line 18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "said tables" in lines 21-22 and 24-25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "each table" in lines 24 and 29. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation “the function groups” in line 26. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “each table” in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “each table” in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “said database” in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “each table unit” in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 contains a parenthetical expression in lines 19-20. It is unclear whether the limitations enclosed by the parentheses are part of the claimed invention.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “the function” in line 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Lines 21-27 in claim 13 are not clearly and positively recited, making it unclear whether or not the application that writes the data onto a writing target table is present or even required.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “the database” in line 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “each table” in line 29. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “each table unit” in line 32. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “said writing target database” in the last line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “each table” in the last line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Lines 28-39 of claim 13 appear to recite active method steps although the claim sets forth in lines 1-2 that components of a computer-readable recording medium are being disclosed.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “each table” in lines 7, 8, 9, and 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “the database” in lines 7 and 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “the table” in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “the tables” in line 17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “each function group” in line 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “the customized functions” in line 24. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Lines 30-31 in claim 15 are not clearly and positively recited, making it unclear whether or not the “adding columns to an original table...” is present or even required.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “each table unit” in line 35. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The first limitation of claim 16 (lines 2-5) is unclear because of grammatical errors. The noun “compatibility” appears in line 2 where an adverb would presumably be more appropriate. Additionally, the article “a” in line 2 before “general-purpose data” appears to be unnecessary if Applicant intends the subsequent recitation of the plural noun “data”.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “each table” in lines 6, 16, and 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “the DLL file” in lines 8 and 24. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “each table unit” in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “each function group” in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Lines 10-14 in claim 16 are not clearly and positively recited, making it unclear which of the recited elements are part of the “entry items”. Additionally, line 14 appears to suggest an active method step rather than an entry item *per se*.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “the function” in lines 15-16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the database" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the customized condition" in lines 22-23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.


Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (703) 305-7737. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:30 am - 5:00 pm. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EBK/EBK
May 24, 2004


TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER